

cution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned that it not be sold until relabeled by obliterating the statements, "43 per cent Protein," and substituting therefor the true statements, "41 per cent protein."

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**15645. Adulteration of canned tomatoes. U. S. v. 447 Cases of Canned Tomatoes. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 22003. I. S. No. 21177-x. S. No. 47.)**

On August 8, 1927, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Supreme Court of the District aforesaid, holding a district court, a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 447 cases of canned tomatoes, at Washington, D. C., alleging that the article had been shipped by Austin, Nichols & Co., from Baltimore, Md., on or about July 18, 1927, and had been transported from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Pride of Talbot Brand \* \* \* Tomatoes Packed by The Choptank Canning Co., Preston, Md."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On March 30, 1928, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**15646. Misbranding of Norma. U. S. v. 11 Dozen Bottles of Norma. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 22401. I. S. No. 19981-x. S. No. 480.)**

On January 26, 1928, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 11 dozen bottles of Norma, remaining in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Norma Laboratories, Inc., from Albany, N. Y., on or about January 6, 1928, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Missouri, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of a soluble phosphate, glycerin, water, a small amount of plant extractive matter, and red coloring matter. Pharmacological examination showed that it was not a vasomotor dilator.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded, in that the statements on the bottle label, "A Vaso Motor dilator. The action of 'Norma' is to relieve the strain on the arteries and blood vessels," regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article, were false and fraudulent, since the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On March 26, 1928, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**15647. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 6 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture entered. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22667. I. S. No. 20249-x. S. No. 677.)**

On March 9, 1928, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 6 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Hope Lake Creamery Co., Litchfield, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped from Litchfield, Minn., on or about March 5, 1928, and had been transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated, in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent of butterfat had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength. Adulteration was